

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant: PRASHER) Confirmation No.: 2876
Application Serial No.: 10/811,597)
Filing Date: March 29, 2004) Group Art Unit: 2841
For: COOLING AN INTEGRATED)
CIRCUIT DIE WITH COOLANT) Examiner: Tuan T. Dinh
FLOW IN A MICROCHANNEL)
AND A THIN FILM)
THERMOELECTRIC COOLING)
DEVICE IN THE MICROCHANNEL)
For: REPLY BRIEF
Attorney Docket No.: P18285
PTO Customer Number 28062
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents (via EFS)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer issued herein on July 22, 2008.

The Examiner's Answer falls far short of addressing, let alone rebutting, the main points of argument set forth in appellant's Brief.

First, the Examiner takes issue with appellant's supposed contention that Messina and Chu are not "analogous art". But appellant does not so contend, and did not in his Brief.

Second, the Examiner completely fails to address the appellant's point that the Examiner has not adduced any "apparent reason" for the proposed combination of references. That is, the Examiner has not even begun to counter appellant's point that the prior art presents no reason why the active cooling provided either by a TFTEC alone or a microchannel cold plate alone would not have been sufficient for all purposes known in the prior art.

Next, the Examiner, at page 8, section c) of his Answer, now at last goes beyond the statement of the Final Office Action (repeated at page 4, second paragraph, of the Examiner's Answer) that it would have been obvious to employ a TFTEC in Messina's apparatus. Now, at page 8 of his Answer, the Examiner makes the further assertion that it would have been obvious to locate the TFTEC in a microchannel. But the Examiner still fails to explain how the teaching of Chu concerning a TFTEC located between a chip and a thermal space transformer would lead one of ordinary skill to place a TFTEC in a microchannel.

The Examiner's approach to the invention remains a superficial, unreasoned attempt to duplicate the claims by plucking features arbitrarily from the references. Appellant submits that reversal of the Examiner's rejections is warranted.

* * * * *

As required, this Reply is submitted within two months after the mailing of the Examiner's Answer.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner or the Board has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, kindly contact the undersigned using the information provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

September 19, 2008
Date

/Nathaniel Levin/
Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460